

**Community Advisory Council
May 10, 2001
Action Items/Notes**

Final

These notes are in the following order:

1. Attendance
2. Quorum
3. Correspondence and handouts
4. Administrative
5. Dose/Risk Assessment Fundamentals, Larry Luckett, BGRR Project
6. Sanitary System Modifications, Phase III, Michael Bebon, Facilities & Operations
7. Addiction Research, Joanna Fowler, Senior Chemist
8. Accelerated Cleanup Committee Update, Richard Amper
9. Update on the Suffolk County grant request, Michael Holland, DOE/BAO
10. CAC discussion of grant request
11. Community Comment
12. Energy Forum update, Jim Hurst
13. June agenda

1. Attendance:

Present:

Members: R. Amper, G. Campbell, R. Clipperton, R. Conklin, J. Corrarino, N. Essel, H. Guthy, J. Heil, J. Hurst, A. Jones, J. Jordon-Sweet, J. Mannhaupt, M. Shea, D. Sprintzen, M. Walker.

Alternates: R. Biss, A. Graves, B. Henigin, E. Kaplan, A. Martin, J. McLoughlin.

Others: M. Bebon, P. Bond, J. Carter, J. Clodius, J. D'Ascoli, R. Desmarais, J. Fowler, Reed Hodgins (Facilitator), M. Holland, M. Kujawa, L. Luckett, M. Lynch, J. Marburger, G. Penny, J. Rohlf, K. White.

Absent:

Members: M. Barrett, A. Capozzi, M. Cohn, S. Cullen, A. Drake, A. Esposito, D. Fischler, M. Giacomaro, J. Gibbons, J. Kassner, C. Kepert, P. Martino, G. Proios, C. Swenson, T. Talbot, F. Towle, J. Tripp.

Alternates: S. Bail, S. Carlin, A. Cooley, K. Crowley, W. Evanzia, J. Grindrod, T. Guglielmo, L. Jacobson, R. Johannesen, G. Miglino, J. Minasi, J. Pannullo, P. Pizzo, W. Prospect, K. Skinner, L. Snead, P. Stephens, K. Timmins.

2. Quorum:

The meeting began at 6:30 p.m. A quorum was established when 18 of the 32 member organizations were present. The draft agenda was amended to include a brief presentation from Michael Bebon on Phase III of the Sanitary System modifications.

3. Correspondence and Handouts: (Items 1 – 4 were mailed with a cover letter dated May 4, 2001. Items 5 – 7 were included in the folders and items 8 and 9 were available as handouts.)

1. Draft agenda for May;
2. Final approved notes of the March 8, 2001 meeting;
3. Draft April notes;
4. Copy of letter CAC sent to Spencer Abraham, Secretary of Energy
5. Draft agenda May, Revision 1;
6. Presentation slides on Dose/Risk Assessment Fundamentals, Larry Lockett
7. Energy Forum Clean Energy Solutions – Part II poster
8. Presentations slides on Sanitary System Modifications, Ph III, M. J. Bebon
9. NYSDEC Notice of Complete Application, improvements to an existing sewage treatment plant

4. Administrative

A quorum having been established, the notes of the April 12 meeting were approved with the following corrections: Item #10 April Energy Forum, alternate energy solutions *not* Clean Energy Solutions and commendations should be recommendations; the date of the meeting should be April 12; and P. Stephens should be listed under Alternates Present. The notes were approved as amended. There were two abstentions.

5. Dose/Risk Assessment Fundamentals, Larry Lockett, BGRR Project.

Mr. Lockett gave a presentation on the process of dose and risk assessment and how it is used in projects such as the decommissioning of the BGRR. He explained that risk assessment provides a benchmark or scale to measure the impact of contaminants not removed, i.e. the risk associated with different levels of clean. He described the process, pathways analysis, and future use scenarios that are considered when evaluating the risk associated with a proposed cleanup alternative. The model described by L. Lockett was RESRAD, which was developed by Argonne Laboratory and is the accepted model used to perform dose calculations and risk assessments for individuals at a site due to residual radioactivity in the soil.

6. Sanitary System Modifications, Phase III, Michael Bebon, Facilities & Operations

Michael Bebon, Assistant Laboratory Director for Facilities & Operations, gave an update on continuing sewage treatment plant upgrades. He gave some background information on the plant and explained the previous upgrade phases. He explained that under Phase III, 9,300 feet of sewer mains will be replaced, 7,200 feet of new mains will be installed, the holding ponds will be upgraded with a new double liner with leak detection, and the sand filter beds will have deteriorated piping and concrete structures replaced. He also discussed the timeline for the construction and the permit application process. A public notice was placed in the Long Island Advance and comments are due on May 25, 2001.

7. Addiction Research, Joanna Fowler, Senior Chemist

Dr. Joanna Fowler began by describing the Imaging Group's interest in understanding why people take drugs, the biochemistry in the brain, and the changes that occur when people become addicted. Dr. Fowler defined addiction as a loss of control over drug taking and used the smoker who continues to smoke after surgery for lung cancer as an example. She explained that the Positron Emission Tomography (PET) scanning device is used to measure biochemical changes

in the brain and other organs. She primarily discussed the role of dopamine receptors in cocaine addiction, the research conducted by the group, and its results.

Action Item: The CAC asked for a summary of the presentation.

8. Accelerated Cleanup Committee Update, Richard Amper

CAC member Dick Amper spoke on possible DOE cutbacks on money for accelerated cleanup. He expressed his concern that funding be maintained for both cleanup and science. He explained that he's written to all the groups on the CAC asking them to communicate directly with elected officials in Washington, DC. He wants to reconvene the Accelerated Cleanup subcommittee within 30 days and will request the support of other Long Island leaders to restore funding. He asked if there were other suggestions, recommendations, or things that the CAC would like the subcommittee to undertake.

Dr. Marburger mentioned that the quotes in a recent news story on the possible budget cuts did not reflect well his position; comments were more those of the reporter than his. In addition, he mentioned a phone call to him by Minna Barrett. In a recent visit to Washington D.C., Minna spoke to Congressman Grucci. The Congressman had received several letters on the subject of restoration of BNL funding and had contacted Senators Schumer and Clinton on the issue. He assured Minna that they were looking into it. Amper urged members to be proactive. Amper described a three step process: 1) groups reaching out individually; 2) the members of groups approaching the government officials; and 3) supportive editorials from local media, such as Cablevision.

9. Update on the Suffolk County grant request, Michael Holland, DOE/BAO

Michael Holland, Manager, Department of Energy Area Office, gave an update on SCDHS grant request for \$50,000 to support the COC's efforts. DOE has received the proposal, reviewed it, had further discussions with the Health Department, and will be processing it. It will be sent to the Department of Energy's Office of Unsolicited Proposal Review located in West Virginia. Mr. Holland explained that the proposal covers the section of the Peconic River in OU V. CAC members asked about technical experts, justification for asking for the grant, and whether it is a normal process for counties to ask DOE for money. Mr. Holland's response was that the DOE has provided funding for local projects in the past, and that the money would most likely come out of the cleanup fund for the Lab site.

10. CAC discussion of grant request

The CAC discussed the merits of the proposal. They questioned Andy Rapijko, representative from the SCDHS about various aspects of the proposal, including the rationale for the application. He explained that the County wanted to make use of the experts that would be available under the grant and that formation of an expert panel was included in the legislation by Suffolk County. Concern was expressed by the CAC on how the activities will impact the schedule. M. Holland said DOE will be looking into it. He also said the regulators said they would be concerned about any negative impacts to delays on OUV, but they have not said not to give the grant. Member Essel noted that the BER had received a presentation on the proposal and had voted to write a letter of support.

A. Rapijko said SCDHS had concerns about the original PRAP and that the experts would add to the County's recommendations on the PRAP. A CAC member expressed concern about the

proposal being a backdoor method to get phyto-remediation into the picture and about the Legislature's lack of concern over restoration activities at Grumman, Calverton. There was also questioning about the reasoning of the legislature.

Action Item: Write a letter to SCDHS requesting the names and resumes of the expert panel being considered under the grant proposal.

Action Item: Send the names and resumes to members of the CAC.

Action Item: Invite the Commissioner, SCDHS to the next CAC meeting to discuss the \$50K grant proposal the Health Department has submitted to the Department of Energy.

11. Community Comment

Adam Martin announced that Mr. Bova, a former CAC Educator Alternate member, recently passed away. It was suggested condolences be sent to his family.

Action Item: Send condolence letter.

12. Energy Forum update, Jim Hurst

Jim Hurst informed the CAC of the details of the final Energy Forum. He reminded the members that the forum will not be at Berkner Hall, but in the Biology Seminar Room. The timeframe for possible recommendations or a report was discussed. The absence of a discussion at the forums on nuclear energy as an energy source was noted. It was indicated that a summary of the notes from the forums would be compiled most likely by, Kathleen Whitley, who has been diligent about recording the sessions.

13. June agenda

- BGRR EECA lower canal
- Cleanup status and path forward (new baseline)(wait until budget is settled)
- OU V update
- Schedule impacts of budget options
- Overview of the grant proposal by the SCDHS Commissioner & sponsoring legislator
- Energy discussion (July)
- Science presentation
- Two community comment sessions, 5 minutes before the break and 5 minutes at end of meeting. (This resulted from a request to put the community comment period earlier in the meeting.)

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.